

Applicants: Turney et al.  
Serial No. 10/034,132  
Response to O.A. 27 January 2006  
Page 6

## **REMARKS**

In the final Office Action pending claims 1-5 stand rejected for an alleged lack of novelty. Herewith independent claim 1 is amended and thus, claims 2-5 depending therefrom are also amended. New claims 14-22 are herewith presented and Applicants note that these new claims closely parallel the system claims of claims 1-5 and should not require additional search, raise new issues or impose an undue burden upon the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry and favorable consideration of the amendments and remarks presented herewith.

Applicants aver that these amendments and remarks are submitted in order to advance prosecution of the application and place the application in condition for allowance.

### **I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,713,937 to Nappholz et al. (Nappholz).

Applicants remind the Examiner that for this ground of rejection to be supported, *each and every limitation* of the rejected claims must be found in Nappholz.

Applicants respectfully assert that Nappholz is devoid of any express or inherent disclosure relating to the claim limitation regarding a means for performing diverse functions; namely:

means for: (i) maintaining a constraining relationship between said interrelated operating parameters when one of the parameters is changed, (ii) ignoring all other unrelated parameters, and (iii) preserving the constraint relations that existed before the dynamic change occurred

Accordingly, amended claim 1 distinguishes over Nappholz.

Applicants: Turney et al.  
Serial No. 10/034,132  
Response to O.A. 27 January 2006  
Page 7


Support for the foregoing claim limitations can be found with reference to the penultimate paragraph of the application as-filed. Thus the rejection based solely upon lack of novelty in view of Nappholz should properly be withdrawn so the claimed invention can pass to timely issuance as U.S. Letters Patent.

## II. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 of the application are in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions regarding the instant application, including this After Final Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 March 06

  
Paul H. McDowall  
Reg. No. 34,873  
Telephone: (763) 514-3351  
Customer No. 27581